

$\downarrow$ -posets

by Lawrence Valby

September, 2016

lvalby@iu.edu, lawrence.valby@gmail.com

1 Abstract

We investigate a certain class of posets arising from semilattice actions. Let S be a semilattice with identity. Let S act on a set C . For $c, d \in C$ put $c \leq d$ iff there is some $s \in S$ with $ds = c$. Then $(C, \leq)$ is a poset. Let's call the posets that arise in this way $\downarrow$ -posets. We give a reasonable second order characterization of $\downarrow$ -posets and show that there is no first order characterization.

2 Introduction

The original motivation for this paper came from Seth Yalcin and Daniel Rothchild and their work on the semantics and pragmatics of natural language conversations [1], but the results described here are of a purely mathematical character, and may be of interest to people who study posets, combinatorial topologists ($\downarrow$ -functions below are related to deformation retractions), and logicians or computer scientists (e.g. is recognizing a $\downarrow$ -poset P or NP-complete?). In addition to thanking Seth Yalcin for bringing the problem to my attention, I would also like to thank George Bergman for valuable input.

A **semilattice with identity** is a set S together with a binary operation $S \times S \rightarrow S$ (written concatenatively) and an element $1 \in S$ satisfying the following universal equations:

1. $ss = s$ (idempotent)
2. $st = ts$ (commutative)
3. $(st)u = s(tu)$ (associative)
4. $1s = s$ (identity)

The quintessential example of a semilattice with identity is a subset S of the powerset of some set W , i.e. $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}(W)$, and the operation is given by intersection, i.e. $st := s \cap t$, and the identity element is the whole set W , i.e.

$1 := W$. Indeed, it is straightforward to prove that every semilattice with identity is isomorphic to such a semilattice with identity.

Let S be a semilattice with identity. We describe what it means for S to **act on** a set C . It means that there is a function $C \times S \rightarrow C$ (the **action**, written concatenatively) that satisfies the following universal equations.

1. $c(st) = (cs)t$ (and so we may write simply cst)
2. $c1 = c$

Notice that we generally use lowercase letters like c, d, e to denote elements of the set C , and lowercase letters like s, t, u to denote elements of the semilattice S .

Let S act on C . We define a binary relation $\leq$ on C as follows. We put $c \leq d$ iff there is some $s \in S$ such that $ds = c$. Any such $\leq$ is in fact a poset; as an example we verify antisymmetry. Let $cs = d$ and $dt = c$. Then $ct = dtt = dt = c$ and so $c = dt = cst = cts = cs = d$. We call the posets that arise in this way (or isomorphic to such a poset) **$\downarrow$ -posets**. Intuitively, we think of elements of C as states of some system, the elements of S as specific acts that may be performed that change the state of the system, and then $c \leq d$ means that it is possible to transition from state d to state c .

The quintessential example of a $\downarrow$ -poset is one that arises as follows. The set C is a subset of the powerset of some set W , i.e. $C \subseteq \mathcal{P}(W)$, the semilattice S is a sub-semilattice of $(\mathcal{P}(W), \cap, W)$, the action $C \times S \rightarrow C$ is given by intersection, and the induced order on C matches $\subseteq$. In fact, every $\downarrow$ -poset is isomorphic to one that arises in this way.

For example, let $W = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $C = \{c, d, e, f, g\}$, and $S = \{s, t, u, \text{id}\}$ where

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| • $c = \emptyset$ | • $s = \emptyset$ |
| • $d = \{1\}$ | • $t = \{1\}$ |
| • $e = \{2\}$ | • $u = \{2\}$ |
| • $f = \{1, 2, 3\}$ | • $\text{id} = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ |
| • $g = \{1, 2, 4\}$ | |

Figure 1 is a picture of the resulting $\downarrow$ -poset (up the page is up in the poset).

This paper is concerned with the question of characterizing which posets are $\downarrow$ -posets. Every semilattice is a poset (via $x \leq y$ iff $xy = x$), and every




Figure 1: Example of a $\downarrow$ -poset




Figure 2: A poset that is not a $\downarrow$ -poset

semilattice is a $\downarrow$ -poset, but **not every $\downarrow$ -poset is a semilattice**. Figure 1 furnishes an example of a $\downarrow$ -poset that is not a semilattice. Furthermore, not all posets are $\downarrow$ -posets. For example, consider the poset in Figure 2. If it were a $\downarrow$ -poset, then there would be some action $C \times S \rightarrow C$ that gave rise to this order. In particular, we would have $es = c$ and $et = d$ for some $s, t \in S$. But then $c = est = ets = d$, a contradiction.

To give the reader a sense of the problem, consider the poset in Figure 3 and see if you can tell whether it is a $\downarrow$ -poset or not. We will answer this question in the next section, using our second order characterization of $\downarrow$ -posets.




Figure 3: A $\downarrow$ -poset, or not?

3 Second Order Characterization

Let $(C, \leq)$ be a poset. We call a function $f: C \rightarrow C$ a $\downarrow$ -**function** when

1. $f(c) \leq c$ (decreasing)
2. $c \leq d$ implies $f(c) \leq f(d)$ (monotone)
3. $c \leq f(d)$ implies $f(c) = c$ (“below-image-fixing”)

An example of a $\downarrow$ -function is, in the context of a $\downarrow$ -poset and a fixed $s \in S$, the function $c \mapsto cs$. In detail, this is decreasing because $cs \leq c$ by the definition of $\leq$, it is monotone because $dt = c$ implies $dst = dts = cs$, and it is below-image-fixing because $dst = c$ implies $cs = dsts = dst = c$.

By way of introduction to $\downarrow$ -functions, we discuss how the definition of $\downarrow$ -function is similar to that of interior operator in topology or box operator in modal logic, yet also different. Let $(C, \leq, \wedge, 1)$ be a poset with finite meets. A function $\Box: C \rightarrow C$ is an interior operator when for $x, y \in C$:

1. $\Box(1) = 1$
2. $\Box(x \wedge y) = \Box x \wedge \Box y$
3. $\Box x \leq x$
4. $\Box \Box x = \Box x$

Both $\downarrow$ -functions and interior operators are decreasing, and both are monotone (in the case of $\square$ this follows from preservation of $\wedge$). Binary meets $\wedge$ might not exist in the case of an arbitrary poset, but all binary meets that do exist are preserved by $\downarrow$ -functions, so they have this in common as well. Furthermore, because $f(c) \leq c$, we get $ff(c) = f(c)$ as a special case of below-image-fixing. However, on the other hand, a $\downarrow$ -function might not preserve 1, even if 1 exists, and so this is a difference. Another difference is that $\square$ might not satisfy below-image-fixing. E.g., consider the usual topology on $\mathbb{R}$ and note that $[0, 1] \subseteq \square\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R}$, but $\square[0, 1] = (0, 1) \neq [0, 1]$.

Theorem 1. *A poset $(C, \leq)$ is a $\downarrow$ -poset iff whenever $c \leq d$ there is a $\downarrow$ -function $f: C \rightarrow C$ such that $f(d) = c$ (we say “there are enough $\downarrow$ -functions”).*

Proof. Suppose first that $(C, \leq)$ is a $\downarrow$ -poset. Let $c \leq d$. Then there is some s such that $ds = c$, and the function $e \mapsto es$ is a $\downarrow$ -function.

Now conversely suppose that $(C, \leq)$ is a poset with enough $\downarrow$ -functions. Let S be the set consisting of the $\downarrow$ -functions of C . We claim that S is a semilattice with identity where the product is the usual composition of functions and 1 is the identity function. This is easy to verify; we include as an example a proof that the composition of $\downarrow$ -functions is commutative. Let f and g be $\downarrow$ -functions. We wish to show $f \circ g = g \circ f$. It suffices to show that $fgc \leq gfc$ for each $c \in C$. Because g is decreasing, $gc \leq c$. Then, because f is monotone, $fgc \leq fc$. Because g is monotone, we in turn get $gfgc \leq gfc$. We claim $gfgc = fgc$, which will establish $fgc \leq gfc$. Because f is decreasing, $fgc \leq gc$. So, because g is below-image-fixing, $gfgc = fgc$.

This semilattice with identity S acts on C in the obvious way. Finally, the $\downarrow$ -poset $(C, \leq')$ this action induces is the same as the original poset $(C, \leq)$. As a relation $\leq'$ is a subset of $\leq$ because $\downarrow$ -function are decreasing, and $\leq$ is a subset of $\leq'$ because of the assumption that there are enough $\downarrow$ -functions. $\square$

To illustrate this theorem, let's return to the poset of Figure 3 and see why it's not a $\downarrow$ -poset. If it were, then there would be a $\downarrow$ -function α such that $\alpha(i) = h$. Because $d, e \leq h$ and h is in the image of α , and α is below-image-fixing, we get that $\alpha(d) = d$ and $\alpha(e) = e$. As $d, e \leq f$, by monotonicity of α we get $d, e \leq \alpha(f)$. Thus, $\alpha(f) = f$ because α is decreasing. This implies that $\alpha(g) = g$ (by below-image-fixing), and so because $g \leq i$ we get by monotonicity $g = \alpha(g) \leq \alpha(i) = h$, which is a contradiction.

I note that the $\downarrow$ -functions of any poset form a semilattice with identity as in the proof of Theorem 1, whether or not the original poset was a $\downarrow$ -poset. In this way, every poset $(C, \leq)$ has a canonical $\downarrow$ -poset $(C, \leq')$ inside of it, in the sense that $\leq'$ is a subset of $\leq$. The nature of these canonical $\downarrow$ -posets and their relationship to the original posets is a matter for further study. Some basic observations about the situation are as follows. First, $\leq'$ is not always a maximal subset of $\leq$ that makes C into $\downarrow$ -poset. Second, although every $\leq$ - $\downarrow$ -function is a $\leq'$ - $\downarrow$ -function, the reverse is not always true.

4 No First Order Characterization

While there is a succinct second order characterization of $\downarrow$ -posets, there is no first order characterization. The class of $\downarrow$ -posets is closed under ultraproducts (as it is definable by an existential second order sentence, implicit in Theorem 1), but its complement is not closed under ultrapowers.

Theorem 2. *There is no first order axiomatization of $\downarrow$ -posets (in the signature only containing $\leq$).*

Proof Sketch. One can give an example of a poset that is not a $\downarrow$ -poset, but has an ultrapower that is. The poset pictured in Figure 4 is such a poset. The basic idea of the example is that if f were a $\downarrow$ -function with $f(b) = a$, then $f(n) = n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (using z_n and the u 's and x 's), and as $f(w)$ must be 0, there is nothing that $f(y)$ can be. On the other hand, a suitable ultrapower of this poset will have an “infinite natural number” below y that can work as $f(y)$. Of course, one has to carefully check that there are no other obstructions to the ultrapower being a $\downarrow$ -poset. $\square$




Figure 4: Not a $\downarrow$ -poset, but suitable ultrapower is

5 Further Questions

Some questions for further study include the following.

1. Is there a first order sentence that is satisfied by a **finite** poset iff it is a $\downarrow$ -poset?
2. Relatedly, is there a polynomial time algorithm that decides whether a finite poset is a $\downarrow$ -poset? (The second order characterization gives an NP algorithm.)
3. Investigate the connection between $\downarrow$ -functions and the deformation retractions of combinatorial topology.
4. Every poset has a canonical $\downarrow$ -poset inside it. Investigate this.
5. Does this result have any bearing on models for the semantics and pragmatics of natural languages?

References

- [1] Daniel Rothschild and Seth Yalcin: *On the Dynamics of Conversation*. Noûs. (2015)